

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/762,241	01/23/2004	Christopher A. Sikora	3929-5 4510	
23117	7590 07/13/2006	E)		KAMINER
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			GRASER, JENNIFER E	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203		LOOK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1645 . DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/762,241	SIKORA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jennifer E. Graser	1645				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lety filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>.</u>					
20,2 ***********************************	,—					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	:x рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 45	03 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	ologian raquiroment					
8) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> are subject to restriction and/or 6	siection requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the ${ t f}$	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	<u> </u>					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau		a				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	a.				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🛄 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/762,241 Page 2

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-6 and 23, drawn to a subcellular protein, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 7-9, drawn to a method for expressing a subcellular protein from a Francisella tularensis infected mammal comprising subculturing said infected mammal in synthetic salts, classified in class 435, subclass 243.
- III. Claims 10-16, drawn to a method for identifying an infectious agent in a mammal, classified in class 435, subclass 4.
- IV. Claim 17, drawn to use of the subcellular protein as a vaccine candidate against a second infectious agent in a mammal, classified in class 424, subclass 184.1.
- V. Claim 18, drawn to use of the subcellular protein as an agent to assess the immune status and level of protection for a mammal vaccinated with a vaccine candidate, classified in class 435, subclass 7.32.
- VI. Claim 19, drawn to use of antisera containing a subcellular protein for probing antigens of said infectious agent to be identified, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.
- VII. Claims 20-22, drawn to a method for assessing in vitro the usefulness of a vaccine lot for quality assurance comprising identifying and quantifying

Application/Control Number: 10/762,241 Page 3

Art Unit: 1645

key subcellular protein in said vaccine lot, classified in class 435, subclass 31.

- VIII. Claim 23, drawn to a method for identifying the presence of a Francisella tularensis infection in a mammal comprising detecting the presence of a subcellular protein, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.
- IX. Claim 24, drawn to a method for identifying the presence of a Francisella tularensis infection in a mammal comprising detecting the presence of anti-myosin antibodies, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- 2. Inventions I and IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the protein of Group I may be used in methods other than detecting an antibody, e.g., they may be used as an immunogen to raise antibodies against the pathogen Francisella tularensis.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the protein of Group I may be made recombinantly or without "subculturing a mammal" as recited in Group II.

Application/Control Number: 10/762,241

Art Unit: 1645

Groups IV, V and VI provide for the "use of" the protein or the antibody directed against said protein, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. These claims are also improper under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). Accordingly, it was unclear where these three different "use claims" belong. If these claims are amended, they will be placed in an existing Group or in a new Group depending on the amendment.

Inventions VII is unrelated to the other Groups. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the method of Group VII does not require the product of any other group. Additionally, the method is not capable of use with any of the different groups and it has different modes of operation and effects. Groups VIII and IX are unrelated to one another because they both detect different products, e.g., Group VIII detects a protein while Group IX detects an antibody. As stated above, the protein of Group I may be used as an immunogen to raise antibodies against the pathogen Francisella tularensis and therefore is patentably distinct from Group IX. Because these inventions are

Application/Control Number: 10/762,241 Page 5

Art Unit: 1645

distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and their recognized divergent subject matter and because the literature search required for the Groups is not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

- 3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

5. Correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1645. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Remsen. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the

Application/Control Number: 10/762,241

Art Unit: 1645

Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15,1989). The Group 1645 Fax number is 571-273-8300 which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E. Graser whose telephone number is (571) 272-0858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith, can be reached on (571) 272-0864.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0500.

Jennifer Graser

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1645 Page 6